Case: 4:17-cr-00100-NAB Doc. #: 83 Filed: 04/18/18 Page: 1 of 1 PageID #: 208

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Courtroom Minute Sheet – Criminal Case

Date 04/18/2018	Judge BAKER		Case No. 4:1	7-cr-00100-NAB	
UNITED STATES OF AMERI	ICA v. Rychlik et a	al			
			Shepard		
Assistant United States Attorney				on	
Attorney(s) for Defendant(s):					
Interpreter	_				
Proceedings:		ROCLEDING			
☐ Initial Appearance ☐ Superv☐ Arraignment☐ Preliminary Examination☐ Motion Hearing☐ Evidentiary Hearing☐ Oral Argument/Non Evidentiary Hearing☐ Oral Argument/Non Evidentiary Hearing ☐ Oral Argument/Non Evidentiary Hearing	B   B   Li   C   Itiary Hearing   R   S Conference in p	Bond Review Bond Execution/Appear n Court Hrg (WAIVE) Change of Plea/Sentence Rule 5(c)(3)Removal (I Derson and via pl	R OF MOTION ing dentity) hone ( Attorr	☐ Pretrial/Status Conference ☐ Material Witness neys Only). Change of	
<u> </u>				rney Christopher Slusher	
to have defendant Henr	y R. Rychlik repo	ort to USMS for p	rocessing.		
☐ Oral Motion for appointment of coun ☐ Bail/Bond set in the amount of: \$ ☐ Secured by cash <b>only</b>		ecured Appearance Bond	Secured by 10%	g of those rights.	
Government filed motion for pretrial	detention. Detention hearing	g scheduled for		before	
Preliminary examination set for		before			
Defendant arraigned Waiv	Defendant arraigned Waives reading of indictment/information Matter taken under advisement				
Plea entered <u>not guilty</u> Order on	pretrial motions:	ued to issue			
Oral Motion for Suppression	on	☐ Written Motion for Ext	ension of Time to Fi	le Pretrial Motions	
Defendant waives		order to issue	oral ruling		
☐ Defendant waives evidentiary hearing	g By leave of court	withdraws all pretrial motio	ns No R&I	R will be forthcoming	
Trial date/time		Before			
Remanded to custody  Next hearing date/time 04/25/201	8 @ 9:30am <sub>Type o</sub>	-		Ellis) Before NAB	
Proceeding commenced 9:02AM	Proce	eeding concluded 9:09A	<u>IVI</u>	Continued to	
☐ Based upon the evidence prod criminal complaint. ☐ Based upon the evidence produced	, the Court finds probable	cause to believe the defend	dant violated the lav	v set out in the instant petition.	